



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2025

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/25/3371303

Lynncroft Bungalow, Hard Lane, Kiveton Park, Rotherham S26 6RP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs J Williamson against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application reference is RB2025/0538.
 - The development proposed is alterations to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to dwelling at Lynncroft Bungalow, Hard Lane, Kiveton Park, Rotherham in accordance with the terms of the application, reference RB2025/0538, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, Site Plan and drawing 01/15/2.
 - 3) Details of the colour of the external render shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority prior to the completion of the new roof. The works hereby permitted shall be completed in accordance with the agreed render colour and the description of materials detailed on drawing 01/15/2.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are whether the proposal would amount to inappropriate development within the Green Belt; whether there would be any other harm to the Green Belt; and whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a small addition to the ground floor of the building and the reconfiguring of the roof to provide further first floor accommodation. It would change the original hipped roof and the lower gabled extensions to a uniform gabled roof with an overall height similar to the highest part of the original roof. It would include a large dormer serving the three first floor bedrooms in the south facing roof slope.

Whether inappropriate development

4. Policy CS 4 of the Core Strategy 2014 which forms part of the Local Plan sets out that land within the Rotherham Green Belt will be protected from inappropriate development as set out in national planning policy. The National Planning Policy Framework 2024 advises that new buildings within the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate unless they fall within an exception set out in the Framework.
5. The council have considered the exception set out in paragraph 154c of the Framework, which accepts the extension of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The Framework does not specify a figure as to what represents a disproportionate addition.
6. On viewing the property and having regard to its size, position and surroundings, the existing extensions, together with the increase in the scale of the roof now proposed, would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The council have provided volume figures for the original house, the existing extensions and the proposed new additions. In combination, these would result in an increase over the original volume of the house of in the region of 60%. This supports my judgement. In 2023 the council adopted Supplementary Planning Document 3: Development in the Green Belt (SPD). This advises in Green Belt guidance 2, that an extension should not exceed more than 33% of the volume of the original building. The proposal would conflict with this guidance.
7. The SPD does state that for large-scale proposals, particularly those in the open countryside, the council will take account of the intended purpose of the extension. If the proposal is to bring an unimproved small home up to modern standards, this may represent a 'very special circumstance' to justify an extension over and above the 33% limit. This does not however suggest that larger additions would not be inappropriate development, only that very special circumstances may exist. The proposal does not therefore gain support from paragraph 154c of the Framework or the SPD with regard to inappropriateness.
8. The Framework was updated in 2024 and paragraph 154g was amended. This now accepts that the partial redevelopment of previously developed land is not inappropriate providing it would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. The definition of previously developed land in the Framework excludes land in built-up areas such as residential gardens. This site represents a residential garden but the council accept that it is not in a built-up area. It therefore falls within the definition of previously developed land.
9. The council do not accept that the proposal represents a redevelopment and suggest that it should be considered under paragraph 154c as an extension. There is nothing in the Framework to suggest that development cannot be considered under more than one exception, only that it satisfies one of them. The proposal would result in the removal of the entirety of the original roof and the two roofs to the extensions. It would also require the removal of parts of the external walls and changes to doors and windows. Given the scale of works proposed and the physical changes to the form and appearance of the property that would result, I find nothing to suggest that this project should not be considered as a partial

redevelopment of this existing house and therefore paragraph 154g can be considered.

10. The test with regard to paragraph 154g is whether the proposal would cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. This does not relate to the original building but the existing situation. In this case, the increase in the footprint of development would be almost insignificant. The overall roof height and the existing eaves heights would not be materially changed. The original roof would have a hip to gable alteration which is a change that does not always require permission. This would however increase the volume as would the increase in height of the lower areas of existing pitched roofs which would be extended to match the original overall height of the roof.
11. SPD Green Belt guidance 1, along with policy SP 2 of the Sites and Policies section of the Local Plan 2018 advise that in considering planning applications for new development and to ensure proposals minimise the impact of the development on the openness of the Green Belt, particular regard will be had to the size, scale, volume, height, massing, position, lighting and any proposed enclosures of the proposals. All new buildings should be well-related to existing buildings, where relevant, and should be of a size commensurate with the established functional requirement. Policy SP 2 also advises that effective siting, screening and high standards of design can minimise the impact of future development on the openness of the Green Belt.
12. Policy SP 2 and the SPD predate the updated paragraph 154g of the Framework, but the works proposed would generally satisfy the mechanisms listed above for limiting the impact on openness. As the proposal would only marginally increase the footprint of the property and would confine new accommodation to be within a reconfigured roof, which itself would not increase the overall height of the property, I am satisfied that given the particular circumstances of this case, the scale of the increase in size and the compactness of the proposed development within the site, would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
13. As the proposal can be considered to be a partial redevelopment of previously developed land and as it would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, it satisfies the exception set out in paragraph 154g of the Framework. It would not therefore represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt for the purposes of the Framework.
14. As policy CS 4 seeks to protect land within the Green Belt from inappropriate development as set out in national planning policy, there is no conflict with that policy or policy SP 2. The proposal would conflict with Green Belt Guidance 6 of the SPD which refers to the development of previously developed land but as that policy is inconsistent with the updated Framework, I afford greater weight to the requirements of the Framework, which it does satisfy.

Other matters and conclusions

15. The council have not raised concerns with regard to the design or the proposed materials. Whilst the property would have a different form and would be visible from the main road, it would sit within this vegetated area, well back from the road. It would have only a very limited wider impact and it would be acceptable in this respect.

16. Matters in support of the proposal have been put forward, including the SPD support for large-scale proposals. However, as the works do not represent inappropriate development, very special circumstances are not required to justify the works. As the proposal satisfies the Green Belt requirements of the Local Plan and the Framework; and as there are no other matters that weigh against the proposal, I allow the appeal.
17. I have imposed conditions relating to the commencement of development and the details of the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. As the materials are specified on the plans, only the colour of the render needs to be controlled by condition to ensure that the development would have a satisfactory appearance.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR